

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/718,538 | 11/24/2003 | Jean-Michel Bernardon | 016800-650 | 1815 |
| 21839 7590 07/05/2007 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | QAZI, SABIHA NAIM | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1616 | |
| | • | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | • | 07/05/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | 10/718,538 | BERNARDON, JEAN-MICHEL | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Sabiha Qazi | 1616 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence ad | ldress | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY | (IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(| S) OR THIRTY (3 | 0) DAYS. | | | |
| WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time (iii) apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI | N. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | • | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Ag | oril 2007. | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| , | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45 | i3 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-33 is/are withdraw | n from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | 1. () | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) <u>10-33</u> are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | , | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce | epted or b) \square objected to by the E | Examiner. | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | aminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form P | 10-152. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) | -(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | • | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents | | | Store | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau | | o in this National | Stage | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | | ed. | | | | |
| · · | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | » 🗖 | (0.70 | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) Linterview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | ate | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | | | | | |

Art Unit: 1616

Non-Final Office Action

Claims 1-33 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time. Claims 1-9 are examined others are withdrawn from consideration as non-elected invention.

Amendments are entered.

Summary of this Office Action date Wednesday, June 20, 2007

- 1. Information Disclosure Statement
- 2. Copending Applications
- 3. Specification
- 4. 35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Written Description Rejection
- 5. 35 USC § 112 --- Second Paragraph Rejection
- 6. Response to Remarks
- 7. Communication

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

References cited in IDS filed on 6/26/2004 are not enclosed. Applicant is requested to provide all the references cited in the IDS.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc., 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Art Unit: 1616

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc., 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Written Description Rejection

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1616

The written description requirement prevents applications from using the amendment process to update the disclosure in their disclosures (claims or specification) during the pendency before the patent office. Otherwise applicants could add new matter to their disclosures and date them back to their original filing date, thus defeating an accurate accounting of the priority of the invention. See 35 USC 132. The function of description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of filing date of the application relied on, the specific subject matter claimed by him.

See Genetech, 108 F 3d 1361, 1365 (Fed. Cir. at 1366, 78, 1999).

The test for determining compliance with the written description requirement is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to one skilled in the art that the inventor had the possession at the time of the later claimed subject matter, rather than the presence or absence of literal support in the specification for the claimed language. See In re Kaslow, 707 F 2d 1366, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

In the present case Applicant has no possession of the claimed subject matter.

The specification does not disclose "analogue compound" of the claimed vitamin

D compounds.

Therefore, Applicant has no possession of the invention of the subject matter as claimed at the time of filing the application. Applicant is kindly requested to explain the issue. **See MPEP 2163.06.**

Art Unit: 1616

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 1. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 2. Claim as drafted is confusing. The protective groups are not clear. Applicant is kindly requested to draw the structure of the claimed compounds so that it would be easier for detailed examination and will be better when published.

Response to Remarks

Applicant's election of group I is acknowledged. Arguments to join claims 6-13 have been considered. Examiner has joined pharmaceutical compositions of claim 6-9 with group I because arguments are found persuasive.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1616

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SABIHA QAZI, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINED